

Remarks

The Office Action and the references cited therein have been carefully reviewed. The following remarks herein are considered to be responsive thereto. Claims 1-10 and 20-26 remain in this application.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections for at least the reasons set forth below. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 20, 22 and 26 patentably distinguish over the cited references and are allowable and that claims 2-10, 21 and 23-25 are allowable at least because they depend from an allowable base claim.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 20-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sony CyberFrame PHD-A55 (CyberFrame) as supported by the product review in TechTV, the product description in Outpost.com and the Sony Hong Kong press release date April 19, 1999 in view of US Patent No. 6,275,375 issued to Nam (Nam).

The CyberFrame product as described by the cited references is a digital photo frame that along with a storage "memory stick" displays JPEG images or MPEG videos.

The patent to Nam discloses a monitor stand that comprises a hub mount for exteriorly mounting a USB hub that is used to connect peripheral equipment to a computer. The monitor stand has a USB hub, and a USB hub mount is formed at a predetermined position of the stand and has a hub cavity for receiving the USB hub. The stand also has a means for holding the USB hub inside the hub mount, with the USB hub being recessed into the hub mount (Abstract).

The presently claimed invention comprises a monitor for a PC, wherein the monitor has a first mode of operation enabling display of a video signal from a PC and a

second mode of operation enabling display of a digital image from the storage medium, the second operational mode being independent of the monitor's connection state to a PC.

The Examiner states “the CyberFrame is not described as a monitor for a PC or as having a mode of operation that enables the display of a video signal from a PC.” The Examiner further states “Nam discloses a monitor containing a stand with a hub mount that may connect to a PC to display a digital image from the PC.” Additionally, the Examiner goes on to conclude that it would have been obvious to “provide a cable connection from the CyberFrame [separate enclosure]/(peripheral device) to the monitor of Nam in order to display the images on the Memory Stick™ of the CyberFrame onto the display of the monitor in order to see the digital images in a larger size, and to transfer images from the PC to the Memory Stick™ for display on the CyberFrame, such that the mode of operation for displaying the image from the CyberFrame is independent from the connection state to the PC.”

Applicant asserts that the combination of the cited CyberFrame product and the patent to Nam does not teach the presently claimed invention that comprises a monitor for a PC, wherein the monitor has a first mode of operation enabling display of a video signal from a PC and a second mode of operation enabling display of a digital image from the storage medium, the second operational mode being independent of the monitor's connection state to a PC.

Nowhere in Nam is it taught or suggested to “provide a cable connection” from one peripheral device to another in order to display the contents of the memory device of one peripheral device on the display of another device. In actuality Nam teaches a “monitor stand with a hub mount suitable for exteriorly and selectively mounting a universal serial bus hub used for connecting various peripheral equipment such as a

telephone, modem, printer, microphone, speaker, scanner, game pad, etc. to a computer.”

Col. 1, lines 14-19.

The USB hub that is taught by Nam is specifically used to connect peripheral devices to a computer. Therefore, it can be assumed that any processing of data that is used between hub-connected devices is initially transmitted to and processed by the computer before being forwarded on to a system-coupled device.

As presently taught by the cited combination, the CyberFrame device and the monitor cannot be combined into one device but rather serve as two distinct peripheral devices that are linked to a central computing processor. Therefore, the presently cited combination teaches away from the present invention that comprises a monitor that has a first mode of operation enabling display of a video signal from a PC and a second mode of operation enabling display of a digital image from the storage medium, the second operational mode being independent of the monitor's connection state to a PC.


Further, in order to implement a second mode of operation enabling display of a digital image from a storage medium, Nam teaches that the CyberFrame device would first have to be connected to the USB hub, wherein the data to be displayed would have to be routed initially through the PC before being transmitted to the monitor. Therefore, the second operational mode would not be independent of the monitor's connection state to a PC but rather dependent upon the connection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the reference of Nam does not cure the deficiencies of the cited CyberFrame product. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted in view of the remarks that presented claims 1, 20, 22 and 26 patentably distinguish over the cited references and are allowable and that claims 2-10, 21 and 23-25 are allowable at

least because they depend from an allowable base claim. Consequently, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-10 and 20-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Thomas Spinelli". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Thomas" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Spinelli".

Thomas Spinelli
Registration No. 39,533

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

TS:WAP:jf